

## **Remarks**

In this response, claims 10, 11, 14, 18, 26, 27, 29, and 31 have been amended and claims 7, 9, 13, and 25 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Support for these amendments is detailed below.

Claims 3 – 6, 10, 11, 14, 18 – 20, 23, and 26 - 35 remain pending.

## **Support for Amendments**

Claims 27 and 32 have been amended to recite, in essence, that the URL is constructed of a pseudo resource identifier nominally identifying a resource of the information server. The information server interprets a first part of the pseudo resource identifier as a product identifier and a second portion as a marketing code.

Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification and, in particular, at least with reference to Figure 5 and associated discussion on pages 25 and 26. A person skilled in the art would understand these teachings to disclose a compound identifier that may not actually identify a resource on the server as the URL standard intended. The compound identifier may include both information for identification of a resource, e.g., a product identifier portion, and information not for identification of a resource, e.g., metadata about where the URL was used in marketing literature. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would understand that the teachings of Figure 5 and associated discussion on pages 25 and 26 properly support “a pseudo resource identifier” as used in this claim.

## **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action claims 27, 29, 31-35, 3-4, 6-7, 13-14, 18, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter “Blinn”) in view of Nazem (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227) (hereinafter “Nazem”), in view of Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter “Bijnagte”) and further in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter “Wolff”).

Claims 7 and 13 have been cancelled rendering their rejections moot.

Claim 27, as amended, recites an apparatus for the provisioning of information pages comprising:

a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions that implements an information server, when contacted by a client device using a uniform resource locator (URL) comprising a server name of the information server immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by a pseudo resource identifier nominally identifying a resource of the information server in accordance with a URL standard, the information server interprets a first portion of the pseudo resource identifier as a product identifier identifying a product and a second portion of the pseudo resource identifier as a marketing code identifying one of a plurality of marketing sources including an internet marketing source and a non-internet marketing source, and in response, constructs and issues one or more queries including the product identifier to retrieve information corresponding to the identified product; dynamically generates instructions to create an associated information page for the identified product for provisioning to the client device, and maintains statistics for the marketing codes; and

at least one processor coupled to the storage device to execute the stored executable instructions.

In the Final Office Action, Blinn, Bijnagte, Nazeem, and Wolf are relied on to make obvious claim 7, which relied on pre-amended claim 27 and included a reference to marketing codes. There is no specific discussion in the Final Office Action about how these references teach the inclusion of marketing codes. The rejection of claim 7 is included in a passage that references specific teachings in Blinn from columns 7 – 12, and, in particular, column 10, line 5 *et seq.* – “The merchant system 120 provides a set of HTML, pages dynamically generated from queries to a database 121 having store information, such as inventory data, advertising copy, product images, pricing, customer information and promotions.”

While claim 27, as amended, is different than claim 7 as previously presented, it does include a marketing code. In particular, claim 27 includes the information server interpreting a first portion of the pseudo resource identifier as a product identifier and a second portion as a marketing code identifying a marketing source. This teaching is explained in accordance with one embodiment on page 26 of the Applicant's

specification. For example, the pseudo resource identifier may be "BC574705BG" and the information server may interpret the "BC574705" as the product identifier and "BG" as the marketing code identifying that the user requesting the information learned of the URL through a buyer's guide.

The cited references do not teach, suggest, or imply such a pseudo resource identifier. The referenced portion of Blinn discusses the HTML pages generated as a response to the request embedded in the URL. There is nothing to teach, suggest, or imply that the requests themselves include marketing codes that provide information as to source of where the user may have obtained the formatted request.

Furthermore, even if the Examiner were to find a teaching of a pseudo resource identifier with a portion interpreted as a marketing code, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to use the identifier in place of the product identifier used after the URL of Wolff. The URL contemplated by Wolff is not constructed by a user, but rather is programmed into an advertising banner. When the link is referenced by the user clicking on the advertising banner, the user's web browser will send a message to the merchant server that includes a "referrer" header giving the server address of the website that displayed the advertising banner, i.e., the sponsor server. Thus, the merchant server in Wolff will know where the user learned about the product (i.e., at the advertising banner displayed by the sponsor server) without using a marketing code in the identifier. Of course, these teachings fail to address the situation provided for by including the marketing code into the identifier as is done in claim 27. Specifically, the teachings of the cited references would not inform a merchant server of where a user learned of information if the user types a URL directly into their browser.

For at least these reasons this combination of asserted references fails to make claim 27, as a whole, obvious.

Claims 31-33, 3-4, 6-7, 13, 23, and 28 depend from, or include limitations similar to claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over these references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 29 as amended recites a method for provisioning information pages by an information server comprising:

receiving a message from a client device resulting from the client device resolving a uniform resource locator (URL) that includes a server name of the information server immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by an identifier;

determining that the identifier includes an industry standard product identifier identifying a product; and

constructing and issuing one or more queries including the industry standard product identifier to retrieve information corresponding to the identified product, and dynamically generating instructions to create the associated information page for the identified product for provisioning to the client device.

None of the cited references teach, suggest, or imply determining that an identifier includes an industry standard product identifier as recited in claim 29.

In Wolff, a merchant provides a server sponsor with a product ID and specifications for an advertising banner. The product ID corresponds to a previously defined record in the merchant's database that has information about a corresponding product. The sponsor server embeds the URL, including the merchant's server name and the product ID, in the advertising banner. When a user clicks on the banner the product ID is transmitted to the merchant server and the merchant server simply uses this value to search for the corresponding record in the database. There is no determination that what comes after the server name is an ISPID.

In the present application, the determination phase of the information server may provide the system with the flexibility to process user-generated URLs (as well as provide the user with input as to acceptable product IDs by reference to the industry standard). If the information server determines that what follows the server name is indeed an ISPID then it knows to construct and issue the queries, which may go to a remote database in the event the local database does not have the requested information. If the information server determines that what follows the server name is

not an ISPID it may provide a default information page and/or an error message to the client without having to query a database. Page 21, line 9 *et seq.*

Claims 14, 18, 34, and 35 depend from claim 29 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

In the Office Action claims 9-11, 19-20 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, Wolff and further in view of Anderson.

Claims 9 and 25 have been cancelled rendering their rejections moot.

The remainder of these claims depend from, or include elements similar to, claim 27 or 29. As discussed above, the combination of Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and Wolff does not make claim 27 or 29, as a whole obvious. Anderson fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over this asserted combination.

In the Office Action claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, Wolff, and further in view of Kirkevold et al. (US Pat. No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter "Kirkevold").

Claim 5 depends from claim 27. As discussed above, the combination of Blinn, Nazem, Bijnagte, and Wolff does not make claim 27, as a whole obvious. Kirkevold fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

**Conclusion**

Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 04/30/2007

/Nathan R. Maki/

Nathan R. Maki  
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981